

REMARKS

The above-identified application is United States application serial number 09/721,012 filed on November 21, 2000. Claims 1-34 and 50-62 are pending. Claims 35-49 are canceled. Claims 1-34 and 50-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wynblatt et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,018,710) (hereinafter "Wynblatt") in view of Ball et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,600,736) (hereinafter "Ball").

Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC §103

Claim 1 includes "an adaptive personalization module operable to monitor the user input during one or more previous sessions with the browser system, and to determine the order for presenting the requested information based on previous user input".

Claim 18 includes "an adaptive personalization module operable to monitor the user input during one or more previous sessions with the browser device, and to determine the order for presenting the requested information based on previous user input".

Claim 50 includes "adaptively determining the order for presenting the responsive information based on user input during one or more previous sessions with the mobile audio device".

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the features in Claims 1, 18, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Wynblatt in view of Ball on pages 3 and 5, respectively, of the Office Action. The Examiner admits that Wynblatt does not disclose an adaptive personalization module operable to...determine the order for presenting the requested information based on previous user input, but then cites Ball (col. 9 lines 4-24) as teaching these features. The cited portion of Ball discloses transferring relevant information between different services during a single session on the browser device (telephone call). (Ball col. 8 line 2-5 and col. 9 line 19). In contrast, Claims 1, 18, and 50 require monitoring the input from one or more previous sessions, not the same session as taught in Ball.

Further, there is nothing in Wynblatt or Ball, alone or in combination, which discloses or suggests that the order of presentation of the information on the PML-formatted page in

Ball is based on previous user input. There is no way to determine the order in which Ball presents the content because Ball does not disclose or suggest such a feature. Additionally, the flowchart that summarizes the steps of the Ball invention does not begin with checking previous user input to determine the order for presenting responsive information. (Ball col. 10 lines 51-60).

Claims 1, 18, and 50 are therefore distinguishable from Wynblatt and Ball, both alone and in combination, for at least the foregoing reasons. Claims 2-17, 19-34, and 51-62 depend from Claims 1, 18, and 50, respectively, and include additional features that further distinguish them from the cited references.

For at least the foregoing reasons, allowance of Claims 1-34, and 50-62 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Claims 39-45 have been canceled. Applicant believes Claims 1-34 and 50-62 are in form for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. In the event it would facilitate prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (949) 251-0250.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO at (571) 273-8300 on the date shown below:

Mary Jo Bertani
(Signature)

MARY JO BERTANI
(Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate)

10/27/05
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Jo Bertani

Mary Jo Bertani
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 42,321

KOESTNER BERTANI LLP
18662 MACARTHUR BLVD.
SUITE 400
IRVINE, CA 92612
TEL (949) 251-0250
FAX (949) 251-0260